

colours . . . present in the 'Melting Pot.' " I am glad to know that American jazz is due to our lack of purity, for now that immigration has virtually ceased, the man on the street will presently prefer symphonies. And as for art, that, too, ought to flower with restricted immigration and less cross-breeding. If these things happen, if America becomes culturally more mature, as the pioneer-settlement stage recedes into history, it will be primarily due, I suppose, to increased racial purity. Our noble stock will keep its blood pure and not contaminate itself by crossing with that of European immigrants.

Dr. Aikman, like Mr. Ludovici, makes appeals to history. And as nearly as I can see, they are equally erroneous. Since the Israelites, he contends, mixed with other stocks (what group has not) they were subdued and captured. This could not happen unless they first deteriorated (p. 165). Q.E.D. There is not a shred of proof that the Israelites were captured because they first deteriorated biologically. This is merely assumed. Yet it is one of the points Dr. Aikman is trying to prove in order to support his case for the superiority of inbreeding in man and the unwisdom of even conservative secondary racial crossing. Such is the logic of these race purists.

Now a case can be made for individual biological purity, a less cogent case for racial purity. But let us not lean over backwards in our attempt to stand up straight. Let us not use false inferences from history, poor sociological reasoning and bad biology to bolster up a doctrine which has only limited tenability and which is utterly incapable alone of explaining the rise, flowering and final decadence of nations, civilizations, groups.

Colgate University, NORMAN E. HIMES.
Hamilton, New York.

The Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I am grateful for the opportunity of replying to Dr. Himes's letter. In so far as I assumed that "the great divisions of mankind which we call races differ widely in their inherent genetic endowment" I was correct, for the primary races differ in some genes as white differs from yellow and black. I believe there are correlated differences, no less real though less obvious, and that it is more scientific to judge the capacity of these races to build great civilizations by their historical records, rather than by what *might* happen in future ages. Caucasian civilization compares favourably, morally (e.g. slavery) as well as materially, with that of the Mongolian and the Negro; and in proportion as the Caucasians follow their greatest Teacher, Jesus Christ, so will that superiority increase.

It is said that I fail to make clear that "the case against hybridization of the primary races is stronger on social than biological grounds." In my view it is bad on both grounds. Intentionally I do not say which is worse. Both heredity and en-

vironment are at work in every case, and one's answer may depend on one's prejudices. Thus it seems probable that "virtually all sociologists" stress the social side of this problem because that is the one to which they have devoted most attention. This does not, however, prove that they are right, and a minority, even of sociologists, do not agree with Dr. Himes.

Professor N. S. Shaler's reasons for his opinion are given *in extenso* and appear worthy of notice and respect. *Human Migration and the Future*, by J. W. Gregory, F.R.S. (1928 edition, p. 171), gives Dr. Eliot's opinion, and to compare it to that of Edison on intelligence tests or of Henry Ford on some historical question seems almost *lèse-majesté* to a Briton, who can but think that the President of Harvard was well placed to judge by observation whether "the marriage of people of different European races produces children weaker and less able than those whose parents belong to the same nation," the more so as he did not attempt to distinguish between the effects of heredity and environment.

Dr. Himes calls Dr. Mjøs another "authority" [*sic*]. The latter has studied Norwegian-Lapp crosses more than any other man. He is regarded as an authority in Scandinavia and in Britain, and held the opinions quoted when I visited him last summer. His view is supported by Professor Lundborg of Uppsala (Sweden) an "authority" of mine who has not been questioned. Dr. Himes has ignored another, Mr. F. L. Hoffman, possibly because his evidence is based on vital statistics and supports the biological view. I appealed to authorities because in a short article it is impossible to give all facts fully.

As to the view that much of the alleged deterioration of American culture, art, music, sexual morality, family life and religion is due to race mixture, I gave reasons, shortly, for thinking it is so; and this view is supported by Dr. Himes's own statement: "The case against hybridization is stronger on social than on biological grounds." European musicians attribute a Negro origin to American jazz music. I merely assumed that it is due to the Negroes and mixed-bloods in the U.S.A., rather than to those in Africa.

I do not share Dr. Himes's optimism regarding the future of art in his great country, "now that immigration has virtually ceased." It is too late for their "noble stock" to "keep its blood pure," and I recall Booker T. Washington's dictum: "The problem is not so much what the white man will do with the Negro, as what the Negro will do with the white man and his civilization." I made no assumption that the Israelites deteriorated *biologically* "from mixture with rather similar races." Their prophets and historians spoke of deterioration, stressing environmental effects (idolatry, etc.) "as virtually all sociologists do." Space compels me to refer Dr. Himes to the Bible, where he will find authority for the view I actually took.

Dr. Himes has shown me no reason for altering one word of my article, where I summed up that "the effects of hybridization . . . are bad, both biologically and socially," and ended, "Socially, however, the complexities of the civilized mind militate against the harmony of such [mixed] married lives, and this must have great weight with the eugenicist."

KENNETH B. AIKMAN.

London.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Dr. Norman E. Himes says it would take him almost fifteen pages to dispose of me and Dr. Aikman. I am afraid it would take me very much more than that to dispose of him! I will, therefore, try to confine myself to the major lacunæ in his reading, and answer only his main objections to my thesis.

(a) In regard to his reply to my claim that "culture, in so far as it is social harmony and order, must be the product of an ordered, harmonious man, and that creators of culture were ordered and harmonious as the result of the inbreeding they practised," I should first like to point out that anyone to-day who questions that a man's expression, whether in culture or anything else, can be different from or contrary to what that man is himself, is assuming a dualism in the human organism which is no longer tenable. This dualism is based on a Socratic hoax by which it is no longer scientific to be duped; Dr. Himes is obviously still duped by it. Secondly, I should like to know how and why Dr. Himes concluded that I believed the above claim to be new, and how and why he is satisfied that it has often been refuted. He says so, and I am aware of the wild and prejudiced statements to that effect; but (though I have read the subject of consanguinity in the literature of seven or eight countries) I have not yet seen the thesis satisfactorily refuted.

(b) In reply to my claim that all early cultures were the product of nations or peoples confined within natural or artificial boundaries which made the exclusion of foreigners and the practice of endogamy inevitable, I should be glad to know why Dr. Himes says "not all early cultures were so confined." Which were not, and what was their ultimate influence on us? I know of no great early culture that was not so confined, and the list I gave was surely exhaustive enough. The difference between us is not merely our use and interpretation of the word "great." It is due partly to Dr. Himes's failure to recognize my implicit argument regarding the subsequent influence of such cultures on us, and partly to his failure to read the report of my paper carefully. He was sufficiently inaccurate not to see that the report gave merely the "substance" of my paper.*

(c) He says that these cultures—and I obviously refer to those of the Egyptians, the Jews and the Greeks, in making the claim—were not incestuous, and that my evidence is "hand-picked." My reply is that Dr. Himes does not know the relevant facts. The Egyptians, as every authority from Diodorus to G. Maspero states, were certainly incestuous in any known sense of that word, and were so not only in their governing but also in their middle and lower classes. And, in the sense of our own and civilized Europe's tables of prohibited degrees of affinity, so were the Jews and the Greeks. Furthermore, all these people were jealous of the purity of their blood and declined the *connubium* of foreign races. See all relevant histories, from Herodotus to Wilkinson, and from the Old Testament to Bury.

(d) He says we do not owe the harmony existing between our social institutions solely to these early civilizations. I said: "What little beauty and harmony our own culture possesses it owes entirely to them" (i.e. these endogamic cultures); and my reply is that it is difficult enough to see beauty or harmony in any culture, whether of Western Europe or America, to-day; but certainly, where it exists—in the family (now fast being broken up), in the degree of national integration still surviving through ideas, and in the order produced through institutions such as justice, communal feeling, and duty to the leader of the state (this integration, too, is being rapidly destroyed), as well as in the beauty of all our principal arts (also necessarily dying now)—every position that matters was first conquered by these ancient cultures.

(e) He also asks what I mean by disharmony of inheritance in man caused by lack of inbreeding. Let me reply in the words of Professor F. A. E. Crew: "The fact that there are inherent differences in the size of organs and parts is of profound significance, when it is remembered that it involves the inevitable sequel that racial and other crossings can lead to serious disharmony."* Truth to tell, the evidence of the fact is overwhelming. In a book I am preparing on the subject, I have found it impossible to include even half of the evidence I have collected. Does Dr. Himes know of Darbshire, and of Miss R. M. Fleming's recent work? If not, let him begin by studying both.

(f) He says I point to an instinct towards homogeneity—"a mere figment" of my imagination. Does Dr. Himes know that the existence of such an instinct has been observed by almost everyone from the Greeks of Homer's (*Odyssey*, XVII, 218) and Plato's day (*Symposium*, 195b, *Laws*, 733) down to a colleague of his own, Boswell H. Johnson?† Does he know that Karl Pearson proved its existence by a statistical inquiry,‡ and that Dr. J. B. Rice agrees with Pearson's conclu-

* *Organic Inheritance in Man*, p. 125.

† *EUGENICS REVIEW*, XIV, p. 258.

‡ *Grammar of Science*, 2nd edition, pp. 429, 431, 436.

* See *EUGENICS REVIEW*, January 1932, footnote, p. 147.